

REMARKS

1. The sole rejection in this case was directed to claims 33 and 36. These claim have now been cancelled.

2. The Examiner is respectfully reminded that a second IDS, including a petition, was filed on March 1, 2004; the reference should be considered.

3. A request for corrected OFR was filed March 14, 2003. We have not yet received a corrected OFR. The Examiner is respectfully requested to investigate.

4. The text recited for claim 22 in the amendment filed October 14, 2003 was actually that of cancelled claim 23. The present amendment recites the correct text of claim 22. Since claim 22 was allowed by the June 13, 2003 office action, this should not be a problem.

5. Claim 1 has been amended to provide better antecedent basis for the "anti-auxin step" referred to in claims 2-5.

6. While claim 2 recites a "second step" before the anti-auxin step of claim 1, and claim 3 recites a "third step" after the anti-auxin step of claim 1, claim 3 is dependent on claim 1, and hence the "second step" is not required for practicing the "third step". If desired by the examiner, the second and third steps could be renamed "pre-anti-auxin" step and "post-anti-auxin step", respectively.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By: 

Iver P. Cooper
Reg. No. 28,005

624 Ninth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
Telephone: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile: (202) 737-3528
IPC:lms G:\ipc\g-i\hoib\Findl\pto amend aftfinal.wpd